REMARKS

These Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed August 28, 2008. Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 18 and 21-31 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. The Examiner is thanked for extending the courtesy of a telephonic interview on Monday September 17, 2008, at 9:00 AM PST. In the interview the Applicant and the Examiner discussed proposed amendments to Claims 1, 13 and 31.

Claims 1, 4, 13, 28 and 31 have been amended. Support for the amendment of Claim 1 is contained in the specification as filed at least at paragraphs [0025], [0031]-[0037] and [0039]-[0043]. The amendment to Claim 4 corrects a grammatical error. Support for the amendment of Claim 13 is contained in the specification as filed at least at paragraphs [0025] and [0048]. The amendment to Claim 28 corrects a typographical error. Support for the amendment of Claim 31 is contained in the specification as filed at least at paragraphs [0008], [0017], [0025] and [0047]. Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 18 and 21-31 remain for the Examiner's consideration. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

CLAIM OBJECTION

Claim 28 has been amended. The Examiner is thanked for his careful reading of the claims.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 18 and 21-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Rekimoto (U.S. Publication No. 2001/0044858 A1) (hereinafter Rekimoto).

Claim 1

Amended Claim 1 includes the limitation "an input device that receives input of a gesture to move a first content from a first display of the plurality of displays to a second display, wherein a second content of the second display is moved from the second display of the plurality of displays". Since Rekimoto does not disclose all the information displayed on the first display it does not disclose all limitations of Claim 1. Accordingly, amended Claim 1 is not anticipated by Rekimoto.

Claim 3

Claim 3 includes the limitation "new content identification information is received from a processor associated with a neighboring display in the reverse propagation direction, the old content identification information is transmitted to a processor associated with a neighboring display in the forward propagation direction, the forward propagation direction derived from the gesture input". The Applicant notes that the words 'reverse' and 'propagation', are not present in Rekimoto. Since Rekimoto does not disclose the reverse propagation direction, it does not disclose all limitations of Claim 3. Accordingly, Claim 3 is not anticipated by Rekimoto.

Claim 4

Amended Claim 4 includes the limitation "retrieving new content identification information from a memory stack". The Applicant notes that the words 'memory' and 'stack' are not present in Rekimoto. Since Rekimoto does not disclose retrieving new content identification information from a memory stack, it does not disclose all limitations of Claim 4. Accordingly, amended Claim 4 is not anticipated by Rekimoto.

Claim 5

The Applicant defines 'gesture input' as initiating new content to be displayed in one display and initiate propagation of content along a direction in a neighboring display (paragraph [0008], second last sentence).

'Pick-and-drop' is an interaction technique for moving data between displays by directly 'picking' up an object from one display with a pointing device and 'dropping' it on another display. Picking and dropping involves touching the displays with a pen, so location, relative orientation and direction of propagation of the displays are irrelevant. Pick-and-drop affects only the displays touched by the pen, and actions are not propagated to other displays. Another technique called 'hyperdragging' extends the reach of a cursor seamlessly from a portable laptop's display to the displays (projected) on the tables and walls in an augmented environment, and objects can be dragged and dropped among different displays and computers. With hyperdragging, the displays are modeled as one continuous surface for the cursor to navigate in.

Location and orientation of tagged laptops are detected with video cameras and are used to determine the edges of the laptop's display to determine the placement of the cursor as it jumps to another display. However, 'hyperdragging' does not initiate propagation of content along a direction in a neighboring display.

Claim 5 includes the limitation "interpreting a direction to move the content from the first display based on the gesture". The Examiner directed the Applicant to Rekimoto paragraphs [0092]-[0093]. These sections of Rekimoto ([0092] an environment type computer stationarily arranged in said information space; and [0093] one or more than one portable computers capable of exchanging digital objects with other computers) do not disclose a direction. A search of the word 'direction' in Rekimoto indicates 33 occurrences. However, none of those 33 instances relate 'direction' to propagation of content. Since Rekimoto does not disclose propagation of content along a direction by a gesture, it does not disclose all limitations of Claim 5. Accordingly, Claim 5 is not anticipated by Rekimoto.

Claim 9

Claim 9 includes the limitation "presenting the second content at the first display includes retrieving a second URL and sending the second URL to the first display". The Examiner directed the Applicant to Rekimoto paragraph [0261]. This section of Rekimoto states "[o]bjects that are movable in the information space 1 of this embodiment include texts, images, URLs (uniform resource locators), sounds and moving pictures". Since Rekimoto does not disclose retrieving a second URL and sending the second URL to the first display, it does not disclose all limitations of Claim 9. Accordingly, Claim 9 is not anticipated by Rekimoto.

Claim 13

Amended Claim 13 includes the limitation "an input device that receives input of a gesture to move a first content from a first display of the plurality of displays, wherein the first content is all the information displayed on the first display". Since Rekimoto does not disclose all the information displayed on the first display it does not disclose all limitations of Claim 13. Accordingly, amended Claim 13 is not anticipated by Rekimoto.

Claim 31

Amended Claim 31 includes the limitation "a plurality of displays, wherein each display neighbors at least one other display, wherein each display is aware of the neighboring displays, wherein each display remains a discrete separately controlled display. Since Rekimoto does not disclose each display remains a discrete separately controlled display, it does not disclose all limitations of Claim 31. Accordingly, amended Claim 31 is not anticipated by Rekimoto.

Claims 2-4, 6, 9, 10, 14, 18 and 21-30 all directly or indirectly depend from independent Claims 1, 5 and 13, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent Claims 1, 5 and 13 and because of the additional limitations of these claims.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 102 rejections.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, it is respectfully requested that all outstanding rejections be reconsidered and withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 11, 2008   By: /Anthony G. Craig/
                                          Anthony G. Craig
                                          Reg. No. 50,342

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928
Customer No. 23910